1	
2	
3	
4	CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY
5	EIR/EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS HEARING
6	
7	OAKLAND CITY HALL
8	1 FRANK OGAWA PLAZA, ROTUNDA
9	AUGUST 28, 2007 - 4:00 O'CLOCK P.M.
10	
11	
12	000
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	REPORTED BY: DEBORAH FUQUA, CSR#12948
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES
2	HON. QUENTIN KOPP
3	Chairman of the Board
4	California High-Speed Rail Authority
5	(Moderator)
6	
7	MEHDI MORSHED
8	Executive Director
9	California High-Speed Rail Authority
10	
11	DAN LEAVITT
12	Deputy Director
13	California High-Speed Rail Authority
14	
15	PUBLIC SPEAKERS
16	VICE MAYOR HENRY CHANG PSOak 1 MICHAEL KIESLING PSOak 9
17	VICTOR OCHOA PSOak 2 GERALD CAUTNEN PSOak 10
18	DANA COWELL PSOak 3 ELLEN PARKINSON PSOak 11
19	JOHN RISTON PSOak 4 RICHARD MLYNARIK PSOak 12
20	BARBARA PATRICK PSOak 5 JIM BIGELOW PSOak 13
21	BENA CHANG PSOak 6 STUART COHEN PSOak 14
22	LIONEL GAMBILL PSOak 7 PAUL GORDENEV PSOak 15
23	WILLIAM BLACKWELL PSOak 8 MARK EVANOFF PSOak 16
24	MARGARET GORDON PSOak 17
25	DAVID WEINRIECH PSOak 18

---000---

PROCEEDINGS

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'm Quentin Kopp. I'm chairman of the California High-Speed Rail Authority. And this is the fourth in a series of seven public hearings devoted to soliciting public comment on the Draft Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train Program Environmental Impact Report under the Environmental California Quality Act and Environmental Impact Statement under the United States Environmental Protection Act.

The Environmental Federal Rail Administration,
I just want to note for the record, is effectively a
partner in the undertaking. And I don't mean from a
financial standpoint necessarily or exclusively, but
also in terms of design and environmental effects and
analysis. In fact, a representative was at both public
hearings last week, which took place in San Francisco,
San Jose respectively. Yesterday, we were in the
Livermore Valley at Livermore City Hall. Tomorrow, we
will be in Gilroy and then on Thursday in Merced. And
then on September 18th, we will be in Stockton at
Stockton City Hall.

And all of these hearings are from 4:00

o'clock until 6:00.

And if we conclude the public testimony

portion of -- as I think we will from the number of

cards I've seen -- about 5:00 o'clock or so, members of

the staff will be present to respond to any further

comments or questions.

But I would like all the comments on the record. I haven't imposed individual speaking limits thus far because people have exercised judgment in not repeating themselves or repeating verbatim a comment by some other speaker necessarily and, number two, concentrating for the most part on the draft EIR and the draft EIS. That is the central part of the reason for the hearing.

People also, in the course of doing that, may compare the two possible alignments from the Bay Area to the Central Valley. I won't be shocked if you do. But keep in mind that that is not the reason for the public hearings. The reason is EIR/EIS, any mistakes, any omissions, any additions which you recommend as the case may be.

We have a court reporter who is reporting all those monumental utterances of not just the chairman but, more importantly, the speakers. And, of course, that reporting will be reduced to a written transcript

that will be available to the members of the Authority Board of Directors and to the staff.

We invite written comments. The time to file or lodge written comments with the Authority endures until September 28th, September 28th. And often oral remarks lend themselves to amplification in written commentary. So I reiterate the invitation to comment in writing.

After all those comments are received, both orally, in the public hearings, and in writing, then process requires analysis by those who I guess we can now pay in some part, now that our budget has been approved for next year in the total amount of \$20,700,000. Don't leap to conclusions, because our wish list was about \$100 million-plus. But in any event, those comments will be analyzed, and of course, that's preparatory to the final EIR/EIS.

I think a couple of times I've indicated, even stated, that probably our approval decision on the EIR/EIS and the concomitant alignment, Bay Area to Central Valley, will occur sometime this fall.

I think I can reasonably be confident that it will happen by the end of the year, probably by the middle of December, maybe in November. I don't think we're going to be able to get to it in October, based on the

numerous comments we've received.

So with those remarks and with the reminder to keep it pertinent and don't repeat, but make sure you flesh out the points you want to make, I begin -- well, I want to introduce these worthies who are sitting to my left and right, Mr. Mehdi Morshed, who is the long time executive director of the Authority, ten years, plus. And on my right Dan Leavitt, who is one of our two deputy directors. And in the audience is Steve Schneid [phonetic], one-time chief consultant to the senate transportation committee, who is one of the persons whom we contract for, for special services.

You can raise your hand, Steve, anyway.

Let me begin by introducing the Vice Mayor of the City of Oakland, the Honorable Henry Chang, who is our first witness. And then Victor Ochoa from the Office of the Mayor.

VICE MAYOR HENRY CHANG: Thank you. Good afternoon. Welcome to City of Oakland. I'm Henry Chang. I'm the Oakland Vice Mayor, also counsel member at large.

On the other hand, I'm also the chair of the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority.

On behalf of the city, I would welcome the Authority here, the Director and also the Deputy Director. I

just -- kind of a pleasant surprise that the deputy
director's father and I actually grew up together for
20, 30 years. I don't know if I get any advantage for
that or not.

Anyway, Oakland is the transportation hub of

Bay Area new growth through 2015.

Anyway, Oakland is the transportation hub of the Central Bay Area and gateway to fast-growing East Bay counties which represent close to 40 percent of the

The Bay Area is also the second-worst congested area in the country behind Los Angeles. High-Speed Rail can remove millions of drivers from California's already saturated freeway system. Today I want to encourage the High-Speed Rail Authority to use the West Oakland BART station as the terminus station in Oakland and also the 12th Street and Oakland City Center stop should be also included in the route. West Oakland BART station offers excellent transfer for both the High-Speed Rail and Amtrak, only seven minutes from San Francisco Downtown.

We look forward to the next phase of the analysis which will determine the final alignment of the Bay Area-to-Central Valley Corridor High-Speed Rail network. We hope that the City of Oakland is given the opportunity to remain a major player in the entire process.

PSOak1-1

PSOak1-2

PSOak1-2 Cont. I want to thank you again for making your presentation here in Oakland.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Mr. Vice Mayor, for making these facilities available to us.

Mr. Ochoa.

VICTOR OCHOA: Thank you, and welcome to Oakland.

Again, my name is Victor Ochoa, for the record, from
the Office of Mayor Ron Dellums.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for being here and thank you to the Deputy Director and Director as well. I do want to focus comments, mainly brief comments, on the alignment issue and why we believe that the Altamont alignment is clearly the best alignment option.

We all know that that is already a severely congested corridor in contrast to the 152 Pacheco corridor, which is not a severely congested corridor. And if we're going to have a linkage between the Bay Area and the Sacramento-Stockton area, then the Altamont is the natural way to do that. If you go the southern route, there's going to be significantly more travel time between the Bay Area and the Sacramento area. That will lead to much less reduction in vehicle traffic, we believe, because people will be faced with the option of taking a roundabout route from the south

PSOak2-1

PSOak2-1 Cont. versus remaining in their vehicles. And that's not an option that is favorable to the environment, and we think the impacts will be very negative.

PSOak2-2

Now, the cost, if all three of the stations are put in place between these areas -- San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose -- the ultimate option with all these of those three stations is about a billion dollars less. So the cost is significantly less if you come through Altamont rather than the southern route.

In addition, I'd like to point out that the draft EIR makes clear that the impact on farmland and floodplain is going to be significantly more if you come through the southern route.

PSOak2-3

PSOak2-4

Now, one of the things that would be good to see is a time analysis regarding the Dumbarton crossing. There's been some issue about the Dumbarton crossing, and there's a lot of legitimate environmental concerns about that because that goes, as I think most of us know, through wetlands. So we think that you really need to look closely at the benefits of that and whether that crossing really is going to offer any real significant benefit in terms of travel time. We don't see it. But maybe that might be an area for furthering more in-depth analysis.

So I just want to leave you with the thought

PSOak2-4 Cont. that the Dumbarton crossing needs to be very carefully looked at, and its benefits at this point look very questionable.

That's my comments. I thank you for your time. And the City of Oakland staff will be preparing more detailed comments. And we look forward to participating in this very, very important project as it moves forward. And we look forward to its fruition some day.

Thank you.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Mr. Ochoa.

I should also tell people who arrived late, there are cards outside if you want to speak. And if you want to speak, we need your name. And if you want to identify an organization with which you're associated, please do that.

Next speaker is Dana Cowell of the San Joaquin Council of Governments, followed by John Riston from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.

DANA COWELL: Thank you Mr. Chair, appreciate being here again today.

I am here today speaking on behalf of the San Joaquin Valley Policy Council. This is a council made up of two elected officials from each of the eight counties in the San Joaquin Valley who take positions

PSOak3-1

PSOak3-1 Cont. on issues that are important to the Valley as a whole. The eight counties of the Valley represented by this policy council have taken a position in support of the Altamont Pass alignment. I know that you've heard from Supervisor Michael Rubio from Kern County, who has been up and presented before you before regarding this position. I'd like to elaborate on some of the points he's made and offer a few other ones on behalf of the Policy Council today.

What we're suggesting with the Altamont alignment is that this provides the opportunity for the High-Speed Authority to be most inclusive in the decisions that you make and the markets that you serve in terms of moving forward in this Phase 1 service.

Particularly, when you look at the northern part of the San Joaquin Valley and 1.3 million people that live there, there's an opportunity to provide service to them by the Altamont alignment. These are some of the fastest growing counties in California in addition to the 1.3 million base population they have right now.

When you look at the service to the Sacramento area, the Altamont alignment provides a distinct benefit in terms of the ability to gain service, provide service to the Sacramento area. It's much faster than the Pacheco alignment. That provides a

PSOak3-1 Cont. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

distinct advantage. When you look at the chance to provide service to Sacramento also, the infrastructure requirements in the future from the Altamont up to the Sacramento area would appear to be much less and a much quicker way to initiate that service up to Sacramento.

PSOak3-2

When you look at the opportunity for service to the Livermore Valley, the communities that are in the 680 and Highway 580 corridors, the Altamont would There are different alignment alternatives do that. that you'll be looking at there, but there are six different places that you could put a station. making your selection in that corridor, there's a possibility of a seventh location, as has been identified by the Regional Rail Plan that's going on concurrent with this effort at the Isabelle Stanley That is between Livermore and Pleasanton. location. That's been identified by the study as a good location for connecting ACE, connecting an extension of BART. It has other multimodal connections, and I would suggest it would be a good things thing to look at in terms of its potential connectiveness for a station in the Livermore Valley as one option.

Assuming a base-case analysis, going through the Altamont alignment provides an opportunity for a connection to BART, as BART service now exists. This

PSOak3-2 Cont. is provided with a chance that the Union City station, as well as out in the Livermore Valley -- so this is a chance to connect directly with BART. And if the base-case service was assumed to San Francisco and San Jose, this provides a chance to use BART to, in fact, connect with the East Bay all the way up to Oakland.

These are all additive areas to providing service, additive markets that could be providing service in addition to the Dumbarton connection also providing service on the corridor to both San Jose and San Francisco. Also, continue the option to make the connection on that particular corridor for San Jose International Airport as well as the San Francisco International Airport. So you can add on additional service to these markets as well as serving the Peninsula with the Dumbarton connection.

PSOak3-3

One of the goals for the High-Speed service is to reduce congestion. When we look at the total inter-regional travel as well as commute travel on the Altamont Pass and we consider the 580 corridor, we find that the 580 corridor in the Tri-Valley area has the second and third most congested sections of highway in the Bay Area. The only part of the highway system that's more congested than the Bay Area is the approaches to the Bay Bridge in the morning on I-80.

PSOak3-3 Cont. So when we look at congestion relief in this corridor, there's a substantial opportunity in terms of the amount of congestion relief that could be provided by High-Speed Rail in one of the most congested corridors in the Bay Area.

PSOak3-4

One of the additional goals of this service is to look at reduction of vehicle miles of travel and, by doing that, also provide additional air quality benefits in the state. By providing more VMT reduction in the San Joaquin Valley via the Altamont corridor versus the Pacheco corridor, you'd be creating a better take-down of vehicle miles of travel. And this is particularly important in the San Joaquin Valley.

As I'm sure you're aware, the San Joaquin
Valley is on its way to being designated as extreme for
ozone. It would be only the second in the United
States as having that distinction. We also are
identified as serious for particulate matter. So the
benefits that High-Speed could provide by going through
the Altamont Pass are particularly important relative
to VMT reduction and air quality values.

That is noteworthy, in particular, when you considered, based on the ridership analysis that's been done for High-Speed Rail, 79 percent of all of your market that you're going to draw into the High-Speed

PSOak3-4 Cont.

PSOak3-5

system would be from vehicular travel. And certainly in the Valley, that is the primary mode to doing regional travel right now, as opposed to air.

So in conclusion, as I look at the product that's been put together for the Authority concerning ridership and revenue forecasts, we find that the volume of inter-regional travel, the travel time under the express -- looking at express service, the base-case costs, the base-case operations are all very close in terms of the Altamont alignment and the Pacheco alignment. In some cases there's actually a benefit to the Altamont alignment for that service.

So we suggest that, with the inclusiveness that you can provide with these additional markets and the connectiveness, it's much closer at hand, by providing Sacramento service, that the Altamont is the right alignment to select.

And I thank you for your time.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Mr. Cowell.

John Riston, Santa Clara Valley Transportation

Authority, and then Barbara Patrick, who is from the

California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley.

JOHN RISTON: Thank you very much, and thank you for having us up here. My name is John Riston, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.

PSOak4-1

PSOak4-1 Cont.

_

PSOak4-2

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation

Authority strongly supports the High-Speed Rail line

connecting Northern California and Southern California

as a really great way to relieve highway and air

traffic congestion between Bay Area and Southern

California. But VTA also believes very strongly that

the Pacheco Pass alignment makes the most sense as the

entry point into the Bay Area for High-Speed trains.

In 2005, the California High-Speed Rail
Authority's Draft Statewide Program EIR/EIS did
conclude that the Pacheco Pass was the better alignment
because it does provide better frequency of service to
critical Silcon Valley job market and up the Peninsula
and San Mateo and into San Francisco.

It more effectively and efficiently meets current and future inter-city travel demand and thus is a better fit for the High-Speed Rail's basic project objectives. It does not require a new San Francisco Bay crossing which would pose considerable environmental challenges and would be costly and potentially result in significant project delays.

We believe that the information presented in the Authority's Draft Bay Area-Central Valley High-Speed Train Program EIR/EIS does not change these conclusions. The Pacheco Pass alignment would provide PSOak4-2 Cont. faster, more direct and more frequent service to the three largest urban centers in the Bay Area: San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland.

We certainly understand the issues of the commuters between the Central Valley and the Bay Area along the I-580 corridor. And VTA is willing to roll up our sleeves and work as a regional solution, separate from High-Speed Rail, to try to find a way to resolve those commuter issues.

Additionally, as one of the partner agencies in the CalTrain Commuter Rail Service, VTA strongly believes that the Pacheco Pass alignment is more consistent with CalTrain's corridor long-range plans.

Finally, as air traffic between the Bay Area and Southern California will continue to grow in the future -- as you know, all three major airports in the Bay Area are severely constrained with their ability to expand. The Bay Area-Southern California traffic corridor is only going to get busier in the future, and the High-Speed Rail provides that sort of service to offset those expansion needs.

Therefore, the primary purpose of the

High-Speed Rail must be to provide a competitive

long-distance transit alternative between Northern and

Southern California. And the Pacheco Pass alignment is

PSOak4-3

PSOak4-4

130ak4-4

PSOak4-4 Cont. the best alternative for achieving that purpose.

Thank you for your time today. And we're prepared to also send written comments as well. Thank you.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

Ms. Patrick, and then Ben Chang -- Bena -- gosh, I should have this down by now -- from the Silicon Valley Leadership Group.

BARBARA PATRICK: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Barbara Patrick, and today I'm representing
the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley
and its Transportation Work Group.

The San Joaquin Valley Partnership is a unique public-private collaboration created by Governor Schwarzenegger. It includes ten work groups, three of which will be impacted by the High-Speed Rail coming through the Valley. And those include the Transportation Work Group, the Economic Development Work Group, and the Air Quality Work Group.

I provide staff support for the Transportation Work Group. And our chairman, Supervisor Frank Bigelow, is unable to be here today. So I am just here letting you know that the Transportation Work Group has been working with the Regional Policy Council that Mr. Cowell spoke of and that we have developed a joint

PSOak5-1

PSOak5-1 Cont. working position on High-Speed Rail.

And the working position includes the following: We believe that High-Speed Rail needs to serve the entire San Joaquin Valley, from Bakersfield to Sacramento, and that the region must stay together as it works toward implementation of the initiative.

We also believe that passenger rail is priority for the Valley and is meeting immediate demand but that our mid and long-term demand will be met by the High-Speed Rail initiative.

The route between the San Joaquin Valley and the Bay Area will have a the significant impact on the Valley. And we believe it is critical that we are served as an entire region. As you are undoubtedly aware, the population of the San Joaquin Valley has grown exponentially. We face major air quality challenges.

And information provided by the High-Speed Rail Authority would indicate that 40 percent of the total ridership of the High-Speed Rail will be generated by or serve San Joaquin Valley communities. Those who choose to be transported by High-Speed Rail rather than passenger vehicles will be part of the solution to our traffic congestion and our air quality challenges.

PSOak5-2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

PSOak6-1

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And lastly, I cannot thank you enough on behalf of the partnership that you are now talking about having seven meetings and that there will be a Stockton meeting. We think it's very important that anything that is so critically important to the San Joaquin Valley have an opportunity to have our citizens have input. So we thank you very much for establishing that meeting. We'll be looking forward to seeing you on the 18th of September.

And thank you very much for your hard work on this issue.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Ms. Patrick.

Ms. Chang.

BENA CHANG: Good afternoon. My name is Bena Chang, and I'm here to speak on behalf of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group.

As you know, the Silicon Valley Leadership Group is a public policy trade association that represents over 200 companies in Silicon Valley. Together our companies provide one out of every four jobs in Silicon Valley.

I wanted to take some time today to really thank the High-Speed Rail Board and staff for organizing this series of hearings throughout the Bay Area on the EIR and EIS. I've attended a couple of

PSOak6-1 Cont. these hearings, and I'm really heartened to see the strong level of general support for High-Speed Rail. It think this bodes well for the upcoming ballot measure in November 2008, and we look forward to working with you on that.

I have personally been on the wonderful
High-Speed Rail systems in Europe and in Japan. And
I've taken these trains mainly because they're
competitive in terms of time and cost with airplanes -or trains -- yes.

These systems are competitive because they connect major urban centers and have limited stops in between. In California, the Leadership Group believes, this can only be accomplished if High-Speed Rail enters the Bay Area via the Pacheco Pass. The Pacheco Pass will connect the northern economies of San Francisco, Oakland, and the Silicon Valley with the economic ventures of the south.

We believe that, if the Board were to select Altamont Pass as the preferred route, we would not be able to surmount the significant environmental concerns involved with the San Francisco Bay crossing.

Consequently, High-Speed Rail would not have a direct connection to San Francisco, which hurts ridership and the overall profitability of the High-Speed Rail

PSOak6-1 Cont. system.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to select the Pacheco Pass as the preferred route.

Thank you very much.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Lionel Gambill and then Bill Blackwell.

PSOak7-1

LIONEL GAMBILL: Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Board and staff, my name is Lionel Gambill. I live in Novato, in Marin County. And I've been following this issue for many years. And I've ridden on both steel-rail high-speed trains as well as Maglev. And I'm a strong supporter of steel rail.

One of the big advantages of California

High-Speed Rail is that it's going to stimulate all
sorts of rail development in California. I think it's
a key part of getting away from our highway dependence,
which has been such a big problem. And it's going to
get much, much worse during the next few years between
global warming and peak oil. So we need to do
everything to get people out of automobiles and off of
highways.

I urge the High-Speed Rail Authority to choose the Altamont Pass alignment. For one thing, it concentrates development where there is already development. That's a very good land use value --

PSOak7-1 Cont.

rather than spurring development in much more sparsely settled areas.

Another, I think, significant advantage of the Altamont corridor is that you'll be able to share right of way with ACE. If you've talked at all to Stacey Mortenson, who manages ACE, she's really, really frustrated with having their trains dispatched by Union Pacific dispatchers in Omaha. And sharing right of way with the High-Speed Rail corridor would be a benefit for them as well. It's a win-win situation.

And the Altamont corridor also offers the lower impacts, lower negative impacts on farmland, floodplains, endangered species.

Again, San Francisco to Sacramento is 41 minutes shorter going through Altamont Pass than through Pacheco Pass. The idea of traveling on a fast train from San Francisco to Sacramento via Los Banos is mind boggling.

There are lower O and M costs for the Altamont Pass. It's better environmentally and economically. The questions that have been raised about crossing the bay in the Dumbarton area, I think, are overblown. There are already two bridges there. There's the highway bridge; there's also a Dumbarton Rail bridge. CalTrain is planning an extension to Fremont. So I see

PSOak7-1 Cont. no reason why High-Speed Rail couldn't share right of way over that bridge with CalTrain. It makes a lot of sense. It cuts your costs, and it cuts CalTrain's costs. So that would be a Redwood City-to-Fremont connection.

The issue of serving San Jose is another issue that I don't think is that serious a problem. A high-speed train -- the High-Speed Rail running time from San Jose to Fremont would be less than five minutes. That's according to the speed projections for California High-Speed Rail. A train starting in San Jose or terminating in San Jose could merge or diverge at Fremont with just a five-minute lapse between Fremont and San Jose.

I think your real problems, of course, are political. An Altamont alignment translates, I think, to strong support from Sierra Club and many other environmental organizations. And I belong to several environmental organizations. You'll have them really working to support your ballot measure. I think that would be more difficult with a Pacheco Pass alignment because of the serious impacts of that alignment.

And I wish you well. I thank you for taking the time to do all this good work and for listening to us. Thank you.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

Bill Blackwell, followed by Michael Kiesling.

PSOak8-1

_

•

WILLIAM BLACKWELL: My name is William Blackwell, an East Bay resident. I favor an Altamont Pass alignment. However, every alternate in the EIR/EIS assumes lightweight trains built for speeds up to 220 miles an hour. There is another alternate for a somewhat slower but still very fast 125-mile-an-hour trains. By my reading, train speeds on the corridor between San Jose and San Francisco and through other heavily populated areas is limited to 125 miles an hour because of noise considerations.

125-mile-an-hour trains are quieter. They're also heavier and thus better able to resists high winds, have a shorter turning radius, use less power, typically require shorter station platforms, have less stringent track construction standards and lower cost train sets. And most importantly, the Altamont Pass can use tilt technology.

All of these features have favorable environmental impacts when compared to the alternatives. Just recently, 125-mile-an-hour tilting trains were chosen to upgrade an existing 400-mile line over a winding, hilly terrain in England because the tilt technology enabled the train to round corners

PSOak8-1 Cont. while maintaining high speeds. Studies showed that there would be no significant loss in ridership, and that has proved to be the case.

Speeds up to 125 miles an hour would provide the vital express lanes between San Francisco and San Jose and between the Bay Area and the Central Valley High-Speed Rail line. And secondly, it would provide the efficacy of service needed for inter-city connectivity and Bay Area commuter trips. It is less costly, which means more fares and even more ridership, and can itself be upgraded in the future to a higher standard.

In effect, I propose simply upgrading the existing CalTrain and ACE lines to a 125-mile-an-hour level of service for both commuters and the end-to-end riders. I ask that this option be included in the EIR/EIS.

Thank you.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

Mr. Michael Kiesling and then Gerald Cautnen.

MICHAEL KIESLING: Good afternoon. Michael Kiesling.

I'm very glad that you at least got something this year in the budget and the whole process didn't come to a horrible -- horribly terrible stop.

PSOak9-1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

PSOak9-2

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Keeps us alive, if not well.

MICHAEL KIESLING: I'll be submitting most of my arcane comments in writing. For right now, this afternoon, I'd like to bring up a couple of points.

I know the EIR a very complex and intertwined document, but there is something that I'd like to see looked at in your draft revision of it.

In the construction costs for your stations along different corridors, sometimes you offer an elevated station and an at-grade station. And in the Altamont corridor, there are a number of stations that are just aerial stations. The difference in cost between the two stations is roughly a quarter of a billion dollars. And the stations in general are the two stations in Tracy, the station at Shinn Street in Fremont, and the station in Newark. Those all just have an elevated option all at about \$300 million apiece.

Looking at those numbers, that's a decision about looking if you want to have an at-grade station instead of an aerial station because, when you start tallying up all the costs, you're getting into something that's a half-a-billion-dollar difference.

Second point about these station construction

PSOak9-2 Cont. costs is, you assume an aerial station at the CalTrain Diridon Station in San Jose building a high-speed deck over where the existing CalTrain tracks are to add capacity because you don't have all the land in the world to keep all the platforms together. That aerial station proposed above an at-grade CalTrain station is only budgeted for \$180 million. Diridon Station in San Jose is the busiest rail station in Northern California. And that the cost of building an aerial station there above an operating rail station is \$100-something million less than building a elevated station at a greenfield site bears some review of -- whoever put the Excel spreadsheet together or whatever just probably missed a zero or something someplace. But that really needs to be scrutinized.

PSOak9-3

About the ridership of whether having one train that serves all three cities in Bay Area on one long run or you have trains starting out from specific terminals, I've got to tell you, every time I ride a train, I like getting on at the terminal because the train's empty and it's easy to get seats. I personally wouldn't want to be in San Jose when a train that's three quarters full comes in after picking up people in Oakland, San Francisco, Redwood City, the San Francisco Airport. But you know, that's just common sense.

PSOak9-3 Cont.

PSOak9-4

Don't want to get in the way of facts.

And finally, the issue of crossing at

Dumbarton has been vexing throughout this entire

process. And I know it is not the job of the

environmental impact report to consider other things

that are sort of outside the realm of what's defined as

"the project." And what you have been told to do is

look at a high-speed rail project. And you have to

sort of go, "Dumbarton Rail is over there somewhere."

But I think, if CalTrain and the partners succeed in building a line from Redwood City to Union City and it's also reasonable to assume that that will use CalTrain's new lightweight technology, I think it's reasonable to assume that it's possible that you could start out running your High-Speed service across the existing upgraded Dumbarton Bridge until the time comes that you have headways where you could dig a tunnel across the Dumbarton.

The San Francisco PUC, in upgrading all their Hetch Hetchy pipes, is currently engineering a tunnel at Dumbarton. They're going to remove the pipes that run on a trestle across the water and stick them in the pipe underneath the refuge because they don't like dealing with the refuge anymore.

Once that project that I think is scheduled to

PSOak9-4 Cont.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

commence in 2009 gets going, the San Francisco PUC is going to spend the money making all the mistakes digging their tunnel. And once you've dug one tunnel in a corridor, you can be more assured of what you're going to find digging a second tunnel.

So hopefully the idea of what's happening at Dumbarton could be a base strategy and not this "the world is ending; we can't cross here because, as a San Franciscan, I would be fine taking BART from the Embarcadero to West Oakland to get on a High-Speed train because it would be a faster trip than going down through Pacheco if you went out through Altamont.

But the other key that we overlooked with that plan is that San Francisco Airport over the Altamont pass is the quickest trip to anywhere in the state. And one of the biggest things we need for airport release, especially at San Francisco Airport, is -we've been on flights there landing. And they start reading down the litany of connecting flights to everyplace else around the state.

And the little teeny tiny plane that takes you to Fresno, the teeny tiny plane that take you to Modesto, the teeny tiny plane that takes you everywhere else, those are the planes that -- if you can get those people coming in from Chicago then onto a high-speed

PSOak9-5

PSOak9-5 Cont. train and somewhere else in the state, it's crucial to serve San Francisco Airport and make those connections, because that's the one main airport that will -- international -- that will be on the High-Speed line.

So you've got a lot more comments. But I'm glad everything's rolling along, and hopefully we'll have a good decision sometime before Christmas.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

MICHAEL KIESLING: You're welcome.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Gerald Cautnen and the last card I have is Ellen Parkinson. If anybody else would like to testify, I'd appreciate your filling out a card.

Good afternoon, Mr. Cautnen.

GERALD CAUTNEN: Mr. Chairman, today I'm representing the California High-Speed Rail Environmental Coalition. It's a loose affiliation of about 22 organizations led by the Planning and Conservation League. And I sort of want to start out by responding to a couple of things that you're hearing from the South Bay contingent.

These groups are both environmental groups in this coalition and rail advocacy groups. But most of them are open-space-oriented groups. I think, as far as I know, the group is unanimous in support of

PSOak10-1

PSOak10-1 Cont.

PSOak10-2

Altamont. They're very well aware of this so-called problem of getting across the bay, be it a new bridge, or a rebuilt bridge, a high bridge, or a low bridge.

And as far as I know, everybody is quite agreed that this is not insurmountable. It's not a big problem that can't be dealt with. I talked to a friend of mine who's probably one of the best bridge engineers in California. And he said that the environmental impacts and the time involved in developing a high-level bridge is about the same as it would be to develop a low-level bridge. So even though it's longer, the impact upon the environment beneath it is not necessarily any greater. So this is not an insurmountable problem.

The other thing I want to respond to is the number of trains that come into San Jose. Now, you've heard that we've got to have more. But I would ask, "How many trains per hour do we need to run into San Jose?" I think the number of trains is going to be a function of the demand. If there are more people who need that train, there's going to be more trains. If there are fewer people, there would be less trains.

San Jose would get direct service to Los

Angeles and to Sacramento with the Altamont

alternative. It's not like one hears, that they're

PSOak10-3 | 15

PSOak10-4

PSOak10-4 Cont. going to get a transfer. That's not true. It's a
direct service. So there's been some misconceptions
floating around that issue.

PSOak10-5

Now to come back to your EIR -- just to come back to the EIR/EIS, I looked a little bit at the table in Chapter 3 regarding riderships. I think it's a very clear, well-organized table. It indicates that Altamont Pass would save 40 minutes between San Francisco and Sacramento, as has been mentioned. It would save 29 minutes between San Jose and Sacramento over Pacheco. So if somebody wants to go to Sacramento from San Jose, he gets better service with Altamont. It saves two minutes between San Francisco and L.A., which is kind of a wash. And it adds ten minutes in the trip between San Jose and Los Angeles, which is not a huge amount.

PSOak10-6

So that the -- I think it's interesting to start with those riderships.

Now, I want to conclude by mentioning three advantages to Altamont. There's many, but I don't like to cite them all because some of them are better than others. Three I think are quite persuasive, quite compelling.

The first, as has been mentioned, it simply serves more people. At least a million more

PSOak10-6 Cont. California's will be served by the Altamont alternative than by the Pacheco alternative. And that number is probably growing as the state grows. So that is number one: High-Speed Rail serves more people with Altamont than Pacheco.

Number two, this is an area that's not been so clearly presented, I think, and that is the incredible opportunity this has to piggy-back a commuter rail system onto the High-Speed right of way just like CalTrain will be piggy-backed on the Peninsula right of way. The right of way between Stockton and San Jose is now a very slow trip. It's about a two-hour trip from Stockton into San Jose. Only the devoted ride that train regularly. That train ought to be coming in in one hour.

Now, if you set out to upgrade that right of way without the High-Speed Railway, that's one huge cost that the region has to sustain. With High-Speed Rail, it's a lesser cost, a significantly lesser cost. It doesn't mean that the High-Speed Rail bond fund would pay for that upgrade; that upgrade would be paid for by supplemental funds. But the bill that the region would have to sustain to upgrade ACE would be far, far lower with the Altamont alternative than the with the Pacheco alternative.

PSOak10-6	
Cont	

And number three, this sort of follows from the first two, the Altamont alignment parallels generally 580 and 680, so that the opportunity to unload the hordes of cars coming into San Jose as well as the rest of the region from 580 and 680 is far greater with Altamont than with Pacheco.

So I think, if the people in San Jose and Santa Clara County would really step back from the fight that's been going on and look at it, they might realize that there are more advantages to them with a really high class Altamont system with the commuter line piggybacked on it than there is with the Pacheco, which is strictly High-Speed Rail and CalTrain, which is -- CalTrain already being there.

Thank you.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: I wanted to ask you a question. Ordinarily I wouldn't do this, but -- would the California High-Speed Rail Environmental Coalition, do you know yet if it would support another bay crossing from San Francisco Airport to Oakland Airport?

GERALD CAUTNEN: That one I've never heard them discuss. I could find out easily enough.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: I'd be interested in an answer to that question.

And then I want to be clear. Does this

coalition support another tube or, say -- "another

tube" -- there's a BART tube and, as the previous

speaker talked about, the Hetch Hetchy pipe. But I'm

talking about a tube for High-Speed Rail trains across

the bay.

PSOak10-7

GERALD CAUTNEN: I think that people would support that; however, it seems like that might be phase six.

It isn't something that's going to happen in the near term.

Given the constraints that the State is already under for the -- just floating the existing bond issue, we think that the Dumbarton crossing is the last best chance to get that second rail crossing into the west side of the bay on a relatively inexpensive cost compared to another 20- or \$25 billion it's going to take to go under Oakland, under Alameda and across the bay.

And the same would apply to the airport connections to a degree. If the money was there, people would probably support it because everybody in this group is well aware of the problem of too much traffic clogging the streets. So they all want to see that done. They all want to see the wetlands and the open spaces protected. They would support any transit-oriented solution that made sense, but we're

also not so unrealistic as to think that's going to 1 PSOak10-7 Cont. happen soon. 2 What could happen in the next few decades, we 3 hope, is a really good high-speed rail system 4 interrelated with a really good bay regional rail 5 network. If the two could come together, it would make 6 Northern California into something a whole lot more 7 interesting than it is now. 8 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Okay. And if you could 9 get that other question answered for me about 10 airport-to-airport crossing --11 I will. MR. CAUTNEN: 12 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: -- I'd appreciate it. 13 GERALD CAUTNEN: Through the marvels of the 14 Internet, I'll do that shortly. 15 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Ms. Parkinson. 16 ELLEN PARKINSON: My name is Ellen Parkinson. 17 PSOak11-1 I'm not an expert or anything like that on 18 this subject. I'm just a West Oakland resident. 19 am with the West Oakland Redevelopment Project Area, 20 and I'm also the co-chair of the Transportation 21 Committee for the West Oakland Redevelopment Project 22

23

24

25

And we've been talking about this for some time.

Our councilperson brought this to us, which is

Ms. Nancy Nadel, a couple of months ago when she first

37

PSOak11-1 Cont. heard about it.

And we were very excited about it, but we would like for this speed rail to be undergrounded and use the BART rail. And where the BART goes down, straight down 7th Street, we would like for it to go underground and share with the fast-track train.

And so that's what we would like to happen because we live in a very high environmental area which is really poisoning the people in West Oakland. So we would love to see the train go through Oakland, not outside of Oakland. And we would hope that maybe some day we could use the BART station and underground the BART station also, and we would have a transportation hub in West Oakland.

So -- and it would take a lot of the traffic out of west Oakland because, actually, the cars are killing West Oakland people and so are the trucks. So if we could get some undergrounding for BART and share with the fast-track train, it would be beautiful. So please think about West Oakland and how people can get to work. There's a problem with people getting to work.

If we had fast trains, what would happen?

Everybody could go to work because you could go to work in a couple of hours. You could even go to Los Angeles

PSOak11-1 Cont.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and back in two hours. So it would be no problem of where to find a job and where to work. So please think of West Oakland.

Thank you.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Ms. Parkinson.

Do you have another card? No? All right.

I want to thank everybody who testified -what? Oh, you have more cards?

Next is Richard Mlynarik, followed by Jim Bigelow, followed by Stuart Cohen.

RICHARD MLYNARIK: Thank you, Chair Kopp.

My name is Rich Mlynarik from San Francisco. I admire you for setting multiple meetings all around the place. You have more patience than I'd have.

I just have one very brief point to make, which is that the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, the Santa Clara County Transportation Authority -- which, as far as I know, is the least successful transportation authority in a city of its size anywhere in the country -- and the City of San Jose are all on record as part of the Santa Clara County sales tax of supporting a Dumbarton Rail crossing. They actually have funding for a Dumbarton Rail crossing.

And the idea that it's okay for CalTrain to

PSOak12-1

PSOak12-1 cross between Redwood City and Fremont, but that the 1 Cont. sky will fall and bay with empty and the fish will die 2 and every bird will fall out of the sky if the 3 High-Speed Rail train runs on the same exact corridor 4 is novel. 5 Thank you. 6 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Mr. Mlynarik. 7 Mr. Bigelow. 8 Jim Bigelow. And today I'm here JIM BIGELOW: 9 PSOak13-1 with the Menlo Park Chamber of Commerce. And I've been 10 affiliated with the Dumbarton Rail project for 20 11 years. Before I talk about that and some of the 12 interface with the High-Speed Rail, I want to make it 13 clear that our chamber of commerce strongly supports 14 the statewide need for High-Speed Rail. 15 Going and cutting to the chafe on the 16 PSOak13-2 Dumbarton Rail corridor, currently there is a project 17 to reactivate a freight line into a commuter rail 18 system. San Mateo County purchased 11 miles, from the 19 Redwood junction to the Newark junction on the east 20 side of the bay. And across the bay, it's a single 21 track in the middle. 22 When it is refurbished and put back into 23 service, estimated to be 2012, it would be with diesel 24 locomotives and heavy rail because there is not funds 25

PSOak13-2 Cont. in the near term to electrify that portion of the line from Union City over to the CalTrain main line.

CalTrain has made a commitment that it will operate equipment from the main line area over to Union City, which is the terminus of that line. There are some key facts that should be thought of in the environmental aspects. The project right now is going through environmental clearance. And there are a variety of issues.

One is the construction times are going to be constrained on the refurbishment because of the mating season, which is several months every year of the species to which the east side of the Dumbarton Rail goes through on the Don Edward's Wildlife Area.

Another issue that's come up, the Dumbarton Rail features a swing bridge, an old swing bridge that would be refurbished that's 18 feet above the water. The maintenance of the South Bay levees -- and Alviso for example, is below sea level. In order to maintain the levee system, both south of the Dumbarton Rail corridor and north, a 37-foot-high dredge has to work back and forth through that area. So you have to be able to get through the rail line.

So for the Dumbarton Rail project, the U.S. Coast Guard has jurisdiction on the navigable

PSOak13-2 Cont. waterway that passes through the line. All we have to do is provide opportunities with the two-week notice to make arrangements to allow the dredge to move back and forth.

So the low-level plan that's for High-Speed Rail, as an example, that's an issue that you need to consider in one of your three options for crossing the Dumbarton corridor.

Last but not least, the only reason the Dumbarton Rail project is going through refurbishment is the \$1.00 toll bridge increase on the bay bridges, Regional Measure 2. The three counties put up seed money, and we currently have about 300 million on what now is anticipated to be at least a \$500 million-plus refurbishment project. So it may need to be phased.

And so there's nothing in the plan that would really accommodate High-Speed Rail on that right of way that is owned by SamTrans. So I would suggest you would need to look to an adjacent crossing and not look at the Dumbarton. And it falls under a different set of categories because it's a refurbishment not a new crossing.

Thank you.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: You started by saying that San Mateo County bought that facility.

JIM BIGELOW: 50 percent, from the State. 1 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: You meant the Joint 2 Powers Authority, didn't you? 3 JIM BIGELOW: The way it ended up, the San Mateo 4 County Transportation Authority put up the money --5 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: I know that. 6 JIM BIGELOW: -- for half. And the State has a 7 loan for half. And that State loan will be paid off 8 in, I believe, 2008. 9 The reason it's owned by SamTrans is because 10 the Transportation Authority that's been putting up the 11 money is a sunset agency. So the title for the 11-mile 12 right of way on the record is owned by SamTrans. 13 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: And not by the JPA? 14 JIM BIGELOW: No. 15 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you. 16 JIM BIGELOW: You're welcome. 17 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Yes, current information. 18 All right. Stuart Cohen, Transportation and 19 Land Use Coalition. 20 STUART COHEN: Good afternoon, and thank you for 21 holding this large number of hearings. The 22 Transportation and Land Use Coalition is a coalition 23 Bay Area-wide of just over 100 environmental, civic, 24 social justice, and housing organizations. 25

PSOak14-1

PSOak14-1 Cont.

PSOak14-2

PSOak14-3

We received a presentation over two years ago from Dan Leavitt on the High-Speed Rail project when the business plan was still being finalized. And we had put some conditions down as criteria that would have to be met before our coalition would support the project. And I'll go through those and what we see in the EIR.

The most important one was really the station locations and that those station locations were primarily going to be in downtowns to serve the future population growth and really become the armature for growing our cities as the center of our economies instead of promoting more sprawl.

I'm certainly happy to say that the business plan and the draft EIR do place almost all of the station locations in existing downtowns and are going to be complemented by land-use policies that the Authority is developing. So, you know, on that front, the coalition strongly supports that component of the plan in that, no matter which of the alignments are chosen over Pacheco or Altamont, San Jose, Oakland, San Francisco, it's all going to their downtowns.

We also didn't want it to go through Henry Coe park and want to avoid parks. And of course, the current proposal is able to avoid direct impacts on

parks. 1 PSOak14-3 Cont. The third one is we wanted it to be 2 PSOak14-4 self-sustaining and not have to dip into transit 3 operating funds from the existing operators. The 4 business plan shows an operating surplus. 5 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: \$300 million a year. 6 STUART COHEN: \$300 million a year, which helps to 7 pay off the program. And again, on that front, the 8 plan, even if it came in slightly smaller, still would 9 be operating a surplus. 10 And so, you know, we as a coalition, still 11 PSOak14-5 have to wait until some of our members take their final 12 positions before moving ahead on what our position 13 would be on the '98 [sic] bond measure. But I just 14 have to say that the staff of the Authority have done a 15 great job with working with the environmental community 16 and the local communities on really designing a program 17 that is going to meet the needs of California for the 18 next century and beyond. 19 And just on two separate fronts, just to kind 20 PSOak14-6 of -- things that have come up in the interim. One is, 21 of course, global warming. And we've been working with 22 the Authority on analyzing the impacts of this. 23 have to say that, at this point, we should be doing 24 this project from a global warming perspective alone. 25

PSOak14-6 Cont.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's going to have the obvious transportation benefits and the land-use benefits. But at 17 million tons per year, this could be -- going to have more benefit in terms of reductions than the Climate Action Team that the administration has set up is looking for from the entire transportation sector.

So to me, this becomes part of AB-32, our climate law implementation. And to the extent the Authority can make that link and other people understand that link, it's going to really benefit this project.

And finally, the local transit agencies don't seem to be, you know, talking much or are agnostic about this project. It really seems to me that, by having placed the locations in the downtowns, it's really going to benefit local transit agencies by bringing a pulse of commuters to the downtowns to do a reverse commute out in the mornings as people get to the downtowns that have to get to other locations.

And that local transit agencies really need to understand that potential benefit and the potential ridership benefits for them so that they can be brought into this process too. I don't really see them very involved at this point.

So those were the comments, and

PSOak14-7

PSOak14-7 Cont.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

congratulations on the funding.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Well, I want to thank you for your compliments to the staff. And could you send me a list of all the component organizations so I get a feel for it?

STUART COHEN: Absolutely.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

Paul Gordenev. And then the last card is from Mark Evanoff.

PSOak15-1

10 PAUL GORDENEV: Yes, thank you very much. My name

11 is Paul Gordenev. I'm a resident of Burlingame,

12 | California. And my career has been entirely with

13 | Class I railroads in the Bay Area and in Missouri and

14 | ten years' advisory committee with SamTrans and also at

15 | Travelers Aid at the San Francisco International

16 Airport.

In regarding to High-Speed Rail, an example,

18 | the core project there with CalTrain on the Peninsula,

19 | I believe CalTrain in an excellent feeder railroad to

20 provide both local and express service to San Francisco

21 and San Jose to make this connection with the corridor,

22 | San Francisco via -- and I recommend Niles Canyon

23 | through Stockton to Los Angeles.

24 And we need only to look at the German

25 | railways for their ICE, their high-speed trains that

PSOak15-1 Cont. interface seamlessly with their ICE, which is their inter-city and there S-bahns, which are their local trains, all which congregate in the city centers with all three forms of transportation interchanging in the city center stations in the downtown of the major hubs in Germany.

I've made 13 trips to Europe and also visited a number of times to New York and Chicago and Boston. And I think that this Niles Canyon route is the preferred line and would be the most efficient to operate the core line from San Francisco via Stockton-Los Angeles, with the line coming also down to San Jose, with CalTrain making the bridge on the Peninsula. And, of course, the other line from Stockton, north, to Sacramento and electrification of all this operation so that they're compatible, of course, with the same voltage with both the commuter lines as well as the High-Speed line. And this is also accomplished in Europe seamlessly.

And one last note, of course, one potential user of this, however long he's still there, of course, Arnold makes frequent trips from Sacramento to Los Angeles. And it would be much faster on the High-Speed Rail than it would be for him to even go to his airport to take his flight, whatever the weather might be in

PSOak15-1 Cont. Southern California.

But much success and much wish that this happens rapidly and good fortune.

Thank you.

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Mr. Gordenov.

And then Mr. Evanoff.

PSOak16-1

PSOak16-2

MARK EVANOFF: My name is Mark Evanoff. I'm a resident of Union City and speaking on behalf of myself. I just wanted to point out that the Altamont alternative seems to be the most cost effective alternative and the least expensive to operate. And you can also use a lot of existing right of way and minimize environmental damage.

I would like to draw to your attention that, by having a stop in Union City, Union City is also in the process of putting in a two-sided BART station with direct connections to Capitol Corridor and Dumbarton Rail. And High-Speed Rail could be under that station. So in terms of phasing High-Speed Rail by having a stop in Union City, there would be immediate access to other parts of the Bay Area by other rail systems, and then High-Speed Rail could gradually expand.

I also wanted to point out that there's going to be 2,000 residential units within one quarter mile of the Union City interval station.

1

Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

PSOak17-1

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: That completes all those who have stated a desire to be heard in this part of the public hearing. I remind you, staff will remain until 6:00 o'clock pursuant to public notice, and the court reporter will also remain in the event any statement by anybody should be a part of the transcribed record.

So I thank you very much for your time and attention and remind you that, if you want to go to Merced tomorrow, come on -- I mean Gilroy tomorrow, come on, and then Merced Thursday and then September 18th in Stockton. Thank you.

MARGARET GORDON: Margaret Gordon, G-O-R-D-O-N, 700 Willow Street, Apartment 15, Oakland, California, 94607.

My concern -- my comments about the new High-Speed Train is that, within West Oakland, we would like it to become underground because we're already impacted in the 7th Street area of West Oakland with BART overhead, the Port of Oakland less than a mile away, and the UPS and -- UPS rail and Burlington Southern, Northern also, all in one area.

We do not need to have anything that's above ground to impact the noise level -- noise level, the

PSOak17-1 Cont. esthetics, vibration, or smells to that community. We do not need that.

So I'm in hopes that this will be totally underground.

Thank you.

PSOak18-1

DAVID WEINRIECH: I'm David Weinriech, and I've lived in California all my life, different parts, and -- both in Orange County, Berkeley for college, Sacramento after college, and now here.

And I am obviously concerned that the project might not go forward. I'm constantly hearing about delays in the vote on the bond.

I would like to see it happen, would like
to -- I think it would be a lot easier for my trips
down to Southern California to visit family to be able
to take this and for business trips as well.

But one thing I've noticed is that there is a difference between the two passes as to which one is easier -- or is faster to get to Sacramento. And that's the main concern for me with the project, is that it goes to as many places as possible. So both -- which means going both to Oakland and to San Francisco and to San Jose. And in Southern California, going to San Diego, Anaheim, going to all those places, but also that it goes to Sacramento because a lot of my business

PSOak18-1 Cont.

trips are to Sacramento.

I know a lot of people take that trip on the Capitol Corridor every day. And for it to take almost as long as the Capitol Corridor train on one of the two routes tells me that not many people are going to use that.

So I would like a system that as many people use as possible -- and that it goes to airports, too, just that it integrates -- it's important that it integrates with other systems.

(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 5:57 o'clock p.m.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1) ss. COUNTY OF MARIN 2 I, DEBORAH FUQUA, a Certified Shorthand 3 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify 4 that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, a 5 disinterested person, and thereafter transcribed under 6 my direction into typewriting and is a true and correct 7 transcription of said proceedings. 8 I further certify that I am not of counsel or 9 attorney for either or any of the parties in the 10 11 foregoing proceeding and caption named, nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said 12 caption. 13 Dated the 11th day of September, 2007. 14 15 16 DEBORAH FUQUA 17 CSR NO. 12948 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25